

REMARKS

Claims 1-59 are pending. Claims 1, 18, 35, and 46 have been amended. Claims 6, 8, 23, and 25 have been previously presented. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-10, 13-17, 19-22, 24, 26-27, 32-34, 36-39, 42-45, and 48-50 are original. Claims 11-12, 28-31, 40-41, 47 and 51-58 have been withdrawn. Claim 59 is new. No new matter has been introduced by the amendment.

1. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) And under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-10, 18, 21-27, 35, 37-39, 45-46 and 48-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sawasaki et al. (U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2003/0043326). Claims 2-3, 19-20 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sawasaki and in view of Shin (U.S. Pat. No. 5,825,449). Claims 13-17, 32-34 and 42-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sawasaki and in view of Song (U.S. Pat. No. 6,307,602). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following remarks.

The Examiner asserts that the limitation “a thickness of the light-shielding color filter patterns are equal to or less than a thickness of the color filter” can be interpreted as “each of the thicknesses of the light-shielding color filter patterns is equal to or less than a thickness of the color filter” (Office Action, page 2; emphasis original). The Examiner further asserts that Sawasaki discloses “thicknesses of the light-shielding color filter patterns are equal to or less than a thickness of the color filter (not a total thickness of the light-shielding color filter patterns is less than a thickness of the color filter” (Office Action, page 4; emphasis original). The Examiner thus has conceded that Sawasaki does not disclose that a thickness of the

light-shielding color filter patterns is equal to or less than a thickness of the color filter.

In contrast, independent claims 1, 18, 35, and 46 have been amended to recite “a thickness of the light-shielding color filter patterns is equal to or less than a thickness of the color filter”. Support for amended independent claims 1, 18, 35, and 46 can be found in Applicants’ specification, for example, on paragraph 0050, lines 1-2; on paragraph 0051, lines 1-2; and in Fig. 4.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that Sawasaki does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as recited in amended independent claims 1, 18, 35, and 46. Accordingly, the rejections against amended independent claims 1, 18, 35, and 46, and thus the rejections against claims 1-10/13-17, 19-27/32-34, 36-39/42-45 and 48-50, which depend from amended independent claims 1, 18, 35, and 46, respectively, have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

2. New Claim 59

New claim 59 depends from amended independent claim 1. As discussed above, amended independent claim 1 should be patentable. It follows that new claim 59 should be patentable. Further, new claim 59 recites that one of the red, green and blue color resins of the light shielding color filter patterns has a trench accommodating another of the red, green and blue color resins. None of the cited reference teaches or suggests at least this feature as recited in new claim 59. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 59 should be allowable. Support for new claim 59 can be found in Applicants’ specification, for example, in Fig. 6H.

Application No. 10/731,950
In Response to Final Office Action Mailed June 25, 2007
Page 21 of 21

3. Restriction Requirement

The Examiner states that claims 11-12, 28-31, 40-41 and 51-54 are withdrawn due to features of "only the plurality of transparent layers filling a space between the thin film transistor and the liquid crystal layer" recited in claims 1, 18, 35 and 46 as amended on October 23, 2006 (Non-Final Office Action Dated January 17, 2007, page 3). The Applicants have deleted the word "only" in amended independent claims 1, 18, 35 and 46 in the current amendments to clarify the claimed features. Accordingly, withdrawal of the restriction requirement regarding claims 11-12, 28-31, 40-41 and 51-54 and examination of same on merits are respectfully requested.

4. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

Date: September 25, 2007

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200